

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 16-23 remain pending.

The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider earlier rejections in light of the following remarks. No new issues are raised nor is further search required as a result of the changes made herein. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 and 16-23 over Croft in view of Gendel and Daimon

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 and 16-23 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,490,439 to Croft et al. ("Croft") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,127,936 to Gendel et al. ("Gendel") and U.S. Patent No. 6,168,515 to Daimon et al. ("Daimon"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-14 and 16-23 recite a system and method that determines an amount of quality achieved above a compliance to an acceptable level necessary to establish a presence in a piconet network, the acceptable level being configurable by a user of a wireless piconet device.

The Examiner relied on the newly cited Daimon to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Croft in view of Genedel to arrive at the claimed features. In particular, the Examiner relied on Daimon to allegedly disclose an "adaptive threshold, set by a user for a particular operation of an electronic device" (see Office Action, page 3). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner cited Daimon to allegedly disclose "adaptive threshold, set by a user for a particular operation of an electronic device". However, if Daimon discloses such an "adaptive threshold", such an adaptive threshold is used for setting a "cleanness degree" (see col. 6, lines 59-60) of air in an automobile (see Fig. 1). The Examiner could potentially find hundreds of devices that rely on the broad concept of "adaptive threshold". However, the Examiner has still failed to provide a single reference, much less Daimon, that disclose or suggest application of an "adaptive threshold" to a piconet device. Daimon fails to disclose or suggest any application to a wireless piconet device,

much less disclose or suggest an acceptable level being configurable by a user of a wireless piconet device, as recited by claims 1-14 and 16-23.

Moreover, the Examiner alleged that the motivation to modify Croft with Daimon's "adaptive threshold" is "for the advantage of providing a user with a higher degree of freedom in setting up operational parameters of the device." (see Office Action, page 8). However, the Examiner fails to show how modifying Croft, that lacks disclosure of any problems associated with setting up operation parameters, in the alleged manner would providing a user with a higher degree of freedom in setting up operational parameters of the device. Croft fails to disclose a lack of freedom that requires any modification.

Thus, Croft in view of Gendel and Daimon still fails to disclose or suggest a system and method that determines an amount of quality achieved above a compliance to an acceptable level necessary to establish a presence in a piconet network, the acceptable level being configurable by a user of a wireless piconet device, as recited by claims 1-14 and 16-23.


A benefit of such a system and method that determines an amount of quality achieved above a compliance to an acceptable link quality level necessary to establish a presence in a piconet network, the acceptable level being configurable by a user of a wireless piconet device is, e.g., a more informed indication of connection quality needed for a particular application. In many applications, a user is only interested in receiving an indication of a link quality that would support a specific application. Such an application could be video and/or audio transmissions. Providing a user with an acceptable link quality level necessary to establish a presence in a piconet network, the acceptable level being configurable by a user of a wireless piconet device allows a user to determine if a link quality will meet a user's requirements for a particular application. The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features having such benefits.

For at least all the above reasons, claims 1-14 and 16-23 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

2000 M Street, NW 7th Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df